

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of KRYSTAL ROSE GROENHOF  
and PATRICIA RAE THOMAS, Minors.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

ROBIN THOMAS and GLEN THOMAS,

Respondents-Appellants,

and

SCOTT GROENHOF,

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED

October 4, 2005

No. 261460

Van Buren Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 02-013789-NA

Before: Saad, P.J., and Jansen and Markey, JJ.

**MEMORANDUM.**

Respondent mother appeals from the trial court's order that terminated her parental rights to both minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(g), (j), and (l). Respondent father appeals from the trial court's order that terminated his parental rights to the minor child Patricia pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(g) and (j). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that at least one statutory ground for termination was established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Respondents failed to provide proper care and custody for their children by not providing proper housing, both in the condition of the structure and their poor housekeeping, and by not keeping the children safe. Indeed, the conditions in the residence were appalling. Although respondents moved into new housing that was appropriate and had kept the home clean during the three months that they lived there, they were not able to remedy the safety issues. Respondent father relied on respondent mother to be the primary caregiver and was out of town for days and weeks at a time with his employment. The oldest child had been molested by a family friend who was living with the family. Despite warnings from the caseworker, respondent mother continued to leave the girls home alone with male friends and to

allow male friends to live in the home. Sadly, even after the move to the new home, respondent mother continued to invite male non-relatives to the home and to allow them to stay there. Based on this evidence, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that MCL 712A.19b(3)(g) and (j) had been established. Because the establishment of only one statutory basis for termination is required, we do not address respondent mother's arguments regarding MCL 712A.19b(3)(l).

Respondents also say that the trial court erred in its best interests determination. Termination of parental rights is mandatory if the trial court finds that the petitioner established a statutory ground for termination unless the court finds that termination is clearly not in the child's best interest. *Trejo, supra* at 354. The trial court did not clearly err in its best interests determination where respondents exposed their children to unsafe and extraordinarily unsanitary housing for an extended period of time and demonstrated an unwillingness or inability to keep their children safe. Although respondent mother says she enjoyed a strong bond with her children and regularly visited them, she did not or would not shield them from potentially harmful situations. Respondent father did not visit the children regularly after obtaining a new job and relied on respondent mother to care for the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Henry William Saad

/s/ Kathleen Jansen

/s/ Jane E. Markey